

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

**Effects of dietary protein source and feeding regime on growth performance, nutrient digestibility, fatty acids and fillet quality traits in Rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*)**

**This is a pre print version of the following article:**

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1576916> since 2017-05-16T14:07:43Z

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1111/jwas.12294

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



**Effects of Dietary Protein Source and Feeding Regime on  
Growth Performance, Nutrient Digestibility, Fatty Acids and  
Fillet Quality Traits in Rainbow Trout (*Oncorhynchus  
mykiss*)**

Journal:	<i>Journal of the World Aquaculture Society</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Gai, Francesco; CNR ISPA, Peiretti, Piergiorgio; CNR ISPA Brugiapaglia, Alberto; University of Torino, Department of Agriculture, Forestry, and Food Sciences Gasco, Laura; University of Turin,
Keywords:	bacterial protein meal, pea protein concentrate, fatty acid, fillet quality traits, rainbow trout

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

# Effects of Dietary Protein Source and Feeding Regime on Growth Performance, Nutrient Digestibility, Fatty Acids and Fillet Quality Traits in Rainbow Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*)

FRANCESCO GAI,<sup>1</sup> PIER GIORGIO PEIRETTI

Institute of Science of Food Production, National Research Council, Grugliasco, Italy

ALBERTO BRUGIAPAGLIA, LAURA GASCO

Department of Agriculture, Forestry, and Food Sciences, University of Torino, Grugliasco,  
Italy

**<sup>1</sup>Corresponding Author:** Francesco Gai; Institute of Science of Food Production, National Research Council, Largo Braccini 2, Grugliasco (TO), Italy, telephone: +39 0116709232; fax: +39 0116709297; e-mail address: [francesco.gai@ispa.cnr.it](mailto:francesco.gai@ispa.cnr.it)

## Abstract

The aim of this study was to investigate the effects of feeding regime and of bacterial protein meal (BPM), pea protein concentrate (PPC) and a mixture thereof (MIX) compared to a control fish meal-based diet on growth performance, nutrient digestibility, fatty acid (FA) profile and fillet quality traits in rainbow trout. A stock of 1200 juvenile rainbow trout were individually weighed (mean weight  $114.6 \pm 0.2$  g) and randomly distributed into 24 fibre-glass tanks (4 diets x 3 replications x 2 feeding regimes). Statistical differences appeared among the diets in terms of crude protein digestibility, while no differences appeared for dry matter, ether extract and gross energy digestibility. Growth performance and somatic indexes were significantly affected by the diet effect, while only the condition factor was influenced by the feeding rate effect. None of the parameters appeared to be affected by the interaction effects. Differences appeared between the FA profiles of the dorsal muscle. Oleic, linoleic,  $\alpha$ -linolenic, and docosahexaenoic acid contents were influenced by diet, while only minor FAs were influenced by feeding regime. Consumer tests showed that fillets of trout fed the MIX diet ad libitum were the most preferred. A similar ranking was obtained with the trout fed rationed diets.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

44           The use of alternative protein sources in aquaculture as fishmeal substitutes is an  
45 extensively studied subject (Bakke-McKellep and Refstie 2008; Médale and Kaushik 2008),  
46 since fishmeal will be a limited resource for fish feedstuff production in the future. In the past  
47 decade, in fact, a great deal of research into aquaculture nutrition has dealt with fishmeal and  
48 fish oil substitution with alternative sources. Various microbes (algae, fungi and bacteria)  
49 have been used to produce a wide range of single cell protein varieties (Anupama and  
50 Ravindra 2000). They can be used for fish or shellfish as a substitute for fish meal (4-5%  
51 substitution) and have been investigated as a feed ingredient in diets for rainbow trout  
52 (Øverland et al. 2006; Aas et al. 2006), Atlantic halibut (Aas et al. 2007), and Atlantic salmon  
53 (Storebakken et al. 2004).

54           Among the protein concentrates derived from fermentation bacteria, noted for its use  
55 as an attractant in fish food and shellfish, Protorsan is a bacterial protein meal (BPM) which is  
56 a by-product of fermentation conducted by Corynebacterium melassecola that led to the  
57 production of L-glutamic acid fermentation carried out using plant substrates, usually from  
58 beet molasses and/or starch hydrolysates. Fermentation takes place anaerobically, under  
59 optimal pH and temperature conditions for the growth of Corynebacterium melassecola, for  
60 about 36 hours, followed by heat treatment of fermentation broth at 75 C for 30 minutes to  
61 deactivate the bacteria. The bacterial mass is then separated from the liquid phase by  
62 centrifugation and subjected to washing and drying. The resulting product is used for animal  
63 feed. Protorsan contains 12% L-glutamic acid, around 7-7.5% of total nucleotides and 4.5%  
64 betaine, a methyl donor with high palatability. It also contains high levels of peptidoglycan as  
65 components of the bacterial cell wall. Protorsan has been tested as a feed stimulant in diets for  
66 sea bream (Chatzifotis et al. 2009), while no studies have been performed in rainbow trout  
67 (Oncorhynchus mykiss).

As far as alternative protein sources are concerned, the best growth performances have been achieved using plant protein concentrates and plant protein mixture (De Francesco et al. 2004, 2007). Among the plant protein sources, field peas (*Pisum sativum*) have reported some success for different fish species such as Atlantic salmon (Øverland et al. 2009), rainbow trout (Thiessen et al. 2003), hybrid sturgeon (Sicuro et al. 2012), common carp (Davies and Gouveia 2010), gilthead seabream (Sánchez-Lozano et al. 2009, 2011), sea bass (Tibaldi et al. 2005, Tulli et al. 2007), African catfish (Davies and Gouveia 2008), and Nile tilapia (Schulz et al. 2007).

Øverland et al. (2009) showed that 20% air-classified pea protein concentrate (PPC) could replace 20% of high-quality fish meal protein in feed without any adverse effect on growth performance, carcass composition or distal intestine histology in Atlantic salmon. By contrast, in another study, as PPC at high inclusion levels was shown to induce enteropathy in the distal intestine of Atlantic salmon, the authors concluded that caution should be used when including PPC in formulated feeds for Atlantic salmon (Penn et al. 2011).

Feeding PPC has been reported to support acceptable weight gain, feed intake, and feed conversion in both Atlantic salmon (Carter and Hauler 2000) and rainbow trout (Thiessen et al. 2003).

The aim of this study was to investigate the effects both of BPM, PPC and a mixture thereof compared to a control fish meal-based diet and of feeding regime on growth performance, nutrient digestibility, fatty acid (FA) profile and fillet quality traits in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*).

89

## Materials and Methods

### Experimental plan

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

92 Three experimental diets were obtained by including BPM, PPC or a mixture of both  
93 protein concentrates (MIX), respectively, replacing fish meal. These experimental diets were  
94 tested against a control fish meal (FM)-based diet; all the diets were isonitrogenous (CP 45  
95 %) and isoenergetic (22 MJ/kg DM).

96 The feeds were manufactured in the laboratory at the Experimental Station of the  
97 Department of Agriculture, Forestry, and Food Sciences of the University of Torino by means  
98 of a pelleting process using a 3.5 mm diameter. Pellets were dried in a stove overnight at 50 C  
99 and then refrigerated at 6 C until utilization.

100

101 Digestibility trial

102 A stock of juvenile rainbow trout was obtained from a private hatchery (Bassignana,  
103 Cuneo, Italy) and transferred to the facility at the Department of Agriculture, Forestry, and  
104 Food Sciences at the University of Torino. An in vivo digestibility experiment was performed  
105 in order to determine the apparent digestibility coefficient (ADC) of the diets following the  
106 experimental design adopted in a previous study reported by Palmegiano et al. (2006). The  
107 ADCs were measured using the indirect acid-insoluble ash (AIA) method; 1% celite® (Fluka,  
108 Switzerland) was added to the diets as an inert marker. The faeces were collected from each  
109 tank using a continuous automatic device, as reported by Palmegiano et al. (2006), six days  
110 per week. The faeces were collected daily and frozen (-20 C) for three consecutive weeks.  
111 The faeces were then dried in a stove in order to determine the dry matter (DM) content.

112 The ADC of the DM was calculated as follows:

113 
$$ADC_{DM} (\%) = (1-A/B) \times 100$$

114 in which A and B represent the AIA concentrations in the feed and faeces, respectively.

115 The ADCs of the crude protein (CP), ether extract (EE) and gross energy (GE) were  
116 calculated as follows:

$$\text{ADCs (\%)} = [1 - (A/B) \times (SB/SA)] \times 100$$

in which SA and SB represent the CP, EE or GE concentrations in the feed and faeces, respectively.

#### Growth trial

A selection of 1200 juvenile rainbow trout (initial mean body weight  $114.6 \pm 0.2$  g) were individually weighed to obtain a homogeneous stock of fish and randomly distributed into 24 fibre-glass tanks ( $0.5 \text{ m}^3$ ) supplied by an open-water circuit with a water flow rate of 25 l/min and a temperature of  $13 \pm 1$  °C while dissolved oxygen was  $7.0 \pm 0.5$  mg/l.

The adopted experimental design was balanced, bi-factorial with four diets x three replicates x two feeding regimes ( $4 \times 3 \times 2$ ). The feeding trial lasted 77 days, after a 2-week period of acclimatisation to the tanks and diets. The feedstuff was distributed by hand, 6 days per week, twice a day with a daily feeding rate of 1.4% of the wet biomass or ad libitum, respectively. Feed intake was checked each time and no feed reject events were recorded during the trial. The biomass tanks were weighed in bulk every 15 days, in order to update the daily feeding rate.

#### Sampling and chemical analysis

At the end of the feeding trial, the fish were starved for one day, then the fish tanks were weighed for final mean body weight. In order to determine the somatic indexes, five trout per tank, with a body weight close to the mean body weight, were sampled and killed. The gut and liver were separated from the rest of the body and weighed. The dorsal muscle tissues from the same fish body were sampled and frozen until the subsequent chemical determinations. The diet and fish muscle samples were freeze-dried before analysis. All the diets were analyzed to determine proximate composition and AIA concentration according to



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

standard methods (AOAC 1990). GE content was determined using an adiabatic calorimetric bomb (IKA C7000, Staufen, Germany).

Gas-chromatographic analysis of the fatty acids

FA composition was determined on the diets and fish flesh samples. The lipid extraction of the samples was performed according to Peiretti and Meineri (2008); the extract was expressed as crude fat and used for the trans-methylation of the FAs. The FA methyl esters in hexane were then injected into a gas chromatograph (Dani Instruments S.P.A. GC1000 DPC; Cologno Monzese, Italy) equipped with a flame ionization detector (FID). The separation of the FA methyl esters was performed using a Famewax™ fused silica capillary column (30m×0.25mm [i.d.], 0.25 µm) (Restek Corporation, Bellefonte, PA, USA). The peak area was measured using a Dani Data Station DDS 1000. Each peak was identified and quantified on the basis of pure methyl ester standards (Restek Corporation, Bellefonte, PA, USA).

pH and Color flesh measurements

pH (pH<sub>24</sub>) was measured on muscles by means of a Crison MicropH 2001 (Crison Instruments, Barcelona, Spain) equipped with a combined electrode and an automatic temperature compensator.

The flesh colour measurements were taken on the inside fillet portion using a bench colorimeter Chroma Meter CR-400 Konica Minolta Sensing (Minolta Sensing Inc, Osaka, Japan) in the CIELAB colour space (CIE 1976). The lightness (L\*), redness (a\*) and yellowness (b\*) were recorded. Three readings were taken on each portion of the fillet and averaged.

### Consumer tests

A sensory panel of 36 untrained PhD students and staff members from the campus of the University of Torino and of the Italian National Research Council of Torino, 21 males and 15 females, ranging in age from 25 to 60 years, participated in this study. Panelists were regular consumers of fish flesh and were already involved in surveys on fish flesh preference/acceptability tests. Consumer tests were carried out in 6 distinct evaluation sessions over three days in the Sensory Evaluation Facility of the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Science of Torino. In each session, a preference ranking test was performed to evaluate the preference of cooked fillets from trout fed with the four experimental diets offered ad libitum or rationed. Between sessions, panelists took a 15 min break. Sixteen trout (two fish from each diet), homogeneous for size and weight, were filleted. The fillets were wrapped in aluminum foil and cooked without additives in an air convection oven at 200 C until the core temperature reached 70 C (about 15 min). After cooking, the fillets were cut into equal portions.

Each panelist received four warm samples corresponding to the 4 diets. Samples were labelled with three-digit numbers, and were offered using a Williams design to balance the order of presentation (MacFie et al. 1989).

Panelists were asked to rank the samples from trout fed with the four diets in order of preference (most preferred =1; least preferred =4). Tap water was offered to the panelists to rinse their mouths between samples.

### Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using the SPSS software package (version 11.5.1 for Windows, SPSS Inc., USA). Growth performance, FA profile and fillet quality traits were analysed by two-way ANOVA by considering dietary protein source, feeding regime and their

192 interaction as the main effects. The data were presented as the means for each group, together  
193 with the significance levels of the main effects and interactions.

194 Analysis of variance was used to evaluate the diet effect on ADC. These data were  
195 presented as the means for each group and the standard deviation (SD). Significance was  
196 established at  $P < 0.05$  for all data.

197 The results of the sensory analysis were analysed by Friedman's test. The Friedman  
198 rank sum was performed to determine whether the panellists were able to discriminate  
199 between samples. Then, the least significant ranked difference values were calculated to  
200 ascertain which samples were significantly preferred to the others (Meilgaard et al. 1991). The  
201 ranking data were analysed by box-plots and correspondence analysis.

203 **Results and Discussion**

204 Composition and fatty acid profile of the diets

205 The ingredients and chemical composition of the four diets are shown in Table 1,  
206 while the FA patterns for the four experimental diets are reported in Table 2.

207 The experimental diets were similar as concerned CP, crude fibre and GE, while the  
208 dietary concentration of EE was lower in the BPM diet than in the other diets. Ash and  
209 nitrogen-free extracts were higher and lower, respectively, in the FM diet.

210 The concentration of crude fat in the bacterial protein resembles that of fish meal,  
211 while the composition of the lipid is different (Storebakken et al. 2004). Phospholipids are the  
212 main lipid components of bacterial protein, consisting mainly of phosphatidylethanolamine  
213 and phosphatidylglycerol (Müller and Skrede, 2003) with predominantly SFA and MUFA and  
214 no PUFA.

215 The experimental diets showed a similar FA profile with slightly high values of  
216 C20:5n-3 (EPA) and C22:6n-3 (DHA) in the FM diet. This diet also showed a slightly higher

217 saturated FA (SFA) and PUFA content than the other diets, while the lowest content of  
218 MUFA was found in the MIX diet.

#### Digestibility of the experimental diets

221 As far as digestibility is concerned (Table 3), statistical differences appeared among  
222 the diets for CP, while no differences appeared for DM, EE and GE. The lowest CP  
223 digestibility coefficients were recorded in the BPM and MIX groups, both fed diets containing  
224 the bacterial protein meal. Similar ADC of nitrogen was found in studies carried out by  
225 Storebakken et al. (2004) and Øverland et al. (2006) in Atlantic salmon and rainbow trout,  
226 respectively. These authors recorded lower nitrogen digestibility with increasing BPM  
227 inclusion compared to a fish meal-based diet, with values of 87% and 83% in fish fed diets  
228 containing 193 and 147 g of bacterial protein meal per kg of diet, respectively. In contrast,  
229 even though this was lower than fish meal-based diets, higher values (91 and 88%) of ADC of  
230 nitrogen were found in trials with rainbow trout and Atlantic halibut fed diets containing 270  
231 and 180 g of bacterial protein meal per kg of diet, respectively (Aas et al. 2006, 2007). The  
232 lower nitrogen digestibility values recorded in the BPM and MIX groups of this study and in  
233 the other trials utilising bacterial protein meal diets, could be due to a negative effect of  
234 bacterial membrane and cell wall components on protein digestibility, as observed in previous  
235 studies in rainbow trout fed single-cell proteins from brewer's yeast (Rumsey et al. 1991;  
236 Kiessling and Askbrandt 1993). Burel et al. (2000) found that extruded peas showed lower  
237 protein digestibility in trout (88%) than in turbot (92%).

#### Growth performance and somatic indexes

240 As far as the growth performance traits and the somatic indexes reported in Table 4  
241 are concerned, all the parameters investigated were significantly affected by the diet effect

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

242 while only the condition factor (CF) was influenced by the feeding rate effect. None of the  
243 parameters showed to be affected by the interaction between diet and feeding rate effect.

244 Compared to the FM group, the trout fed alternative protein source diets had lower  
245 weight gain and specific growth rates (SGR). Similar results were found by de Francesco et  
246 al. (2004) in a long-term feeding study where large rainbow trout were fed with a plant  
247 protein mixture-based diet. In contrast, de Francesco et al. (2007) found similar weight gain  
248 and SGR in gilthead sea bream fed with a plant protein high-level fish meal replacement diet.  
249 In our trial, trout fed alternative protein source diets were characterised by a higher viscero-  
250 and hepato-somatic index but a lower carcass yield. A decrease in dressed carcass and fillet  
251 yield was also observed in a study carried out in trout fed plant proteins and guar gum as fish  
252 meal replacements (Brinker and Reiter, 2011).

253 A similar effect on CF was observed in a study carried out in Atlantic salmon fed to  
254 satiation or moderately reduced rations of high or low energetic feeds, in which the rationed  
255 fish showed the lowest CF values (Johnsen et al. 2011).

256  
257 Fatty acid profile of the fillet

258 While it is common to see changes in the FA profile when dietary fat is modified  
259 through changes in dietary lipid sources, there is little information as regards the effects of  
260 changes in FA content as affected by dietary protein sources. Indeed, total replacement of fish  
261 meal by plant protein ingredients modifies FA profiles to a certain extent with the consequent  
262 changes seen in muscle FA profiles (Tables 5 and 6). As far as FA composition of different  
263 fillets is concerned, C18:1n-9, C18:2n-6, C18:3n-3, and DHA contents and some minor FAs  
264 (such as C15:0, C16:2n-4, C17:0, C16:3n-4, C18:3n-6, C20:1n9, C20:4n-6, C21:0 and  
265 C22:1n-9) were influenced by diet, while only minor FAs (such as C16:1n-9, C16:2n-4,

C16:3n-4, C18:3n-4, C20:1n9 and C22:1n-9) were influenced by feeding regime (Table 5).  
An interaction was found only for two minor FAs (C16:2n-4 and C22:1n-9).

In common with other studies on rainbow trout (De Francesco et al. 2004; Morris et al. 2005) the FA content of trout muscle in the present study was significantly influenced by that of the feed. In fact, it is well known that dietary FA composition strongly influences flesh FA composition in fish (Sargent et al. 2002). As shown by Palmegiano et al. (2006), who evaluated the use of rice protein concentrate as a potential substitute of fish meal in rainbow trout, fillet FA profile reflects diet composition, but some FAs are not present in the same proportion and this induces one to suppose that an elongation and desaturation process has occurred. Numerous FAs were present at higher proportions in the flesh lipids than in the feeds, including C18:1n-9 and DHA. However, C18:2n-6, C18:3n-3 and EPA were all present at lower relative percentages in the flesh than in the feeds. Preferential accumulation and/or retention of selected FAs, including C18:2n-6, C20:4n-6 and DHA, has previously been recorded in rainbow trout (Greene and Selivonchick 1990).

In the present study, MUFA and PUFA content (total PUFA, PUFA n-3, PUFA n-6 and their ratio) were influenced by diet treatment, while only MUFA content was influenced by feeding regime without interaction between factors (Table 6), as previously demonstrated in rainbow trout fed with a plant protein mixture-based diet (De Francesco et al. 2004). They reported that SFA, MUFA and PUFA n-3 and the n-3/n-6 ratio were significantly higher in trout fed diet based on fish meal, while PUFA n-6 (above all in C18:2n-6) were significantly higher in trout fed diet based on mixture of plant protein sources (corn gluten meal, wheat gluten, extruded peas, and rapeseed meal), while the main difference observed in single FA was the higher incidence and content of C18:3n-3 in fillet of trout fed diet based on mixture of plant protein sources in comparison to those fed the fish meal, no differences were found for eicosapentaenoic (EPA) and the docosahexaenoic (DHA) acid levels. This result was

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

291 consistent with the data obtained by Gomes et al. (1993), who observed an increased level of  
292 PUFA n-6, in particular of C18:2n-6, in muscle of rainbow trout fed diets with increasing  
293 levels (5%, 10%, 15% and 45%) of a co-extruded plant protein (rapeseed and peas). It is  
294 reassuring to note that at the same lipid level, EPA and DHA were no different between the  
295 two groups of trout.

296 Morris et al. (2005) reported that, with the exception of five individual FAs (C16:2n-6;  
297 C20:4n-6; C20:4n-3; DHA and C24:1n-9), the FA profile of the rainbow trout flesh responded  
298 linearly to changing proportions of individual FAs in the feed formulated with extracted soya  
299 (7.5%) and full-fat soya (0–25%). Although the percentage of DHA and PUFA n-3 in the  
300 fillet was not significantly influenced by the level of soya in the feeds, the relative proportions  
301 of the fish and soybean derived PUFA n-3 shifted towards the latter, i.e. higher relative  
302 percentages of C18:3n-3, in response to a higher proportion of soya-derived fat in the feeds.

303 The challenges of creating new plant-based feed ingredients for salmonid diets are  
304 providing high-quality protein and providing a source of PUFA n-3 (Drew et al. 2005). Fish  
305 oil is the most widely-used source of PUFA n-3, required by salmonids to maximize growth  
306 potential and maintain the PUFA n-3 content of the fish carcass desired by consumers.  
307 Rainbow trout can elongate and desaturate C18:3n-3 into EPA and DHA (Owen et al. 1975),  
308 but most plant oils are poor sources of C18:3n-3.

309

310 Fillet quality traits

311 Parameters of fillet pH and colour are reported in Table 7; all the parameters  
312 investigated were significantly affected by the treatments except redness for the diet effect  
313 and yellowness for the feeding rate effect, respectively. None of the parameters appeared to  
314 be affected by the interaction between diet and feeding rate effect.

The fillet pH level after 24h was slightly higher for fish fed BPM and MIX diets while similar values were found for the FM and PPC groups. Brinker and Reiter (2011) observed a reduction in pH 24h post mortem in fillets of trout fed a mixture of fish meal and plant protein-based feeds and they attribute the observed reduction in pH to the differences in fillet energy stores. The same authors found that the pure plant diet appears to increase undesirable yellowness in the trout fillets, in agreement with the results of the present trial where we found a similar trend in fish fed the PPC and MIX diets.

In our trial, the feeding rate modified the redness values of the trout fillets with the higher values recorded in rationed fish while satiation feeding induced higher red colour intensity ( $a^*$ -value) compared to restricted feeding in a study carried out in Atlantic salmon (Johnsen et al. 2011). The same authors did not find any differences in the lightness values, in contrast to the findings from the present trial where lightness values decreased in fillets from the rationed groups.

Fillet composition in terms of DM, CP, EE, and ash content is reported in Table 8. The results for fillet composition showed that only CP content was affected by the diet effect with an increased content in fish fed fish meal-alternative protein sources. A similar increase was also observed by De Francesco et al. (2004) in large rainbow trout fed with plant protein mixtures in replacement of fish meal. The same effect was also reported in rainbow trout fed diets where 25, 50, 75, or 100% of the fish meal protein was replaced with a mixture of rendered animal protein ingredients (Lesiow et al. 2009). DM and ash content were affected by feeding rate effect, fillets from rationed fish groups showed an increased content of DM and a decreased ash content compared to ad libitum groups.

#### Consumer tests



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

339 The results of the preference ranking test concerning the trout fillets fed ad libitum  
340 with the four diets are reported in Fig. 1. Fillets of trout fed the MIX diet ad libitum obtained  
341 the highest number of most preferred votes as well as the best median value (Fig. 2). Fillets of  
342 trout fed the FM diet ad libitum obtained the largest number of least preferred and the  
343 smallest number of most preferred votes. Fillets of trout fed the BPM and PPC diets ad  
344 libitum had the majority of votes in 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>th</sup> preference votes, 75% and 53% respectively.

345 The Friedman's test showed that there was a significant difference ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) in  
346 preference between the fillets (Table 9). Fillets of trout fed the MIX diet ad libitum were the  
347 most preferred (rank sum = 72), followed by the BPM diet ad libitum (rank sum = 89), PPC  
348 diet ad libitum (rank sum = 90) and FM diet ad libitum (rank sum = 109).

349 A similar ranking was obtained with the rationed trout, although no significant  
350 difference in preference between the four fillets was observed (Table 9).

351 Fillets of trout fed the rationed MIX diet obtained the highest number of most  
352 preferred votes (Fig.3). Fillets of trout fed the rationed PPC diet obtained the same number of  
353 most and least preferred votes. The rationed BPM diet had the majority of 2<sup>nd</sup> preference  
354 votes while the rationed FM diet received the largest number of least preferred votes. The  
355 rationed FM and PPC diets showed the worst median values (Fig. 2).

356 The overall results can be represented in the correspondence analysis plot (Fig. 4).  
357 Dimensions 1 and 2 explain 58% and 39% of the inertia, respectively.

358 Fillets of trout fed the MIX diet ad libitum and 1<sup>st</sup> preference votes, and, fillet of trout  
359 fed the rationed FM diet and 4<sup>th</sup> preference votes, showing the highest deviation from the  
360 origin, gave the main contribution to the inertia of dimension 1 and dimension 2, respectively.  
361 According to the distribution of samples in the plane, it can be seen that the samples preferred  
362 by the consumers are found to the right in the plot and near the 1<sup>st</sup> preference votes. The next  
363 two groups, rationed BPM diet and BPM diet ad libitum, are found on the left near the 2<sup>nd</sup>

364 preference votes. Less- preferred fillets were from FM diet ad libitum and rationed FM diet  
365 near the 4<sup>th</sup> preference votes, while rationed PPC diet and PPC diet ad libitum, near the 3<sup>th</sup>  
366 preference votes, are found between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> preference votes.

367

368

### Acknowledgements

369 Financial support for this work was provided by the MIPAAF (Ministero delle  
370 Politiche Agricole e Forestali, Italy) RENAI project. The authors thank Dr. Marco Ortoffi  
371 (Institute of Science of Food Production, National Research Council), Luciano Sola and Dario  
372 Sola for their careful management of the fish and Vanda Malfatto (Department of Agriculture,  
373 Forestry, and Food Sciences, University of Torino) for their technical assistance during the  
374 laboratory analysis. All the authors contributed equally to the work described in this paper.

375

Literature Cited

**Aas, T. S., B. Hatlen, B. Grisdale-Helland, B. F. Terjesen, A. M. Bakke-McKellep and S. J. Helland.** 2006. Effects of diets containing a bacterial protein meal on growth and feed utilisation in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Aquaculture* 261:357–368.

**Aas, T. S., B. Hatlen, B. Grisdale-Helland, B. F. Terjesen, M. Penn, A. M. Bakke-McKellep and S. J. Helland.** 2007. Feed intake, growth and nutrient utilization in Atlantic halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus*) fed diets containing a bacterial protein meal. *Aquaculture Research* 38:351–360.

**Anupama and P. Ravindra.** 2000. Value-added food: single cell protein. *Biotechnology Advances* 18:459–479.

**AOAC.** 1990. Official Method of Analysis, 15th Edn. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, AOAC, Washington, DC.

**Bakke-McKellep, A. M. and S. Refstie.** 2008. Alternative protein sources and digestive function alterations in teleost fishes. Pages 445–478 in J.E.P. Cyrino, D.P. Bureau and B.G. Kapoor, editors. *Feeding and Digestive Functions of Fishes*. Science Publishers, Enfield, NH, USA.

**Brinker, A. and R. Reiter.** 2011. Fish meal replacement by plant protein substitution and guar gum addition in trout feed, Part I: Effects on feed utilization and fish quality. *Aquaculture* 310:350–360.

**Burel, C., T. Boujard, F. Tulli, S. J. Kaushik.** 2000. Digestibility of extruded peas, extruded lupin, and rapeseed meal in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and turbot (*Psetta maxima*). *Aquaculture* 188:285–298.

**Carter, C. G. and R. C. Hauler.** 2000. Fish meal replacement by plant meals in extruded feeds for Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar* L. *Aquaculture* 185:299–311.

- 1  
2  
3 400 **Chatzifotis, S., Arias, M. V., Papadakis, I. E., and P. Divanach.** 2009. Evaluation of  
4  
5 401 feed stimulants in diets for sea bream (Sparus aurata). The Israeli Journal of Aquaculture -  
6  
7 402 Bamidgeh, 61(4):315–321.  
8  
9 403 **CIE.** 1976. Commission internationale de l'éclairage. Colorimetry. Publication 15,  
10  
11 404 Bureau Central de la CIE, Vienna, Austria.  
12  
13 405 **Davies, S. J. and A. Gouveia.** 2008. Enhancing the nutritional value of pea seed meals  
14  
15 406 (Pisum sativum) by thermal treatment or specific isogenic selection with comparison to  
16  
17 407 soybean meal for African catfish (Clarias gariepinus). Aquaculture 283:116–122.  
18  
19 408 **Davies, S. J. and Gouveia, A.** 2010. Response of common carp fry fed diets containing a  
20  
21 409 pea seed meal (Pisum sativum) subjected to different thermal processing methods.  
22  
23 410 Aquaculture 305:117–123.  
24  
25 411 **De Francesco, M., G. Parisi, F. Médale, P. Lupi, S.J. Kaushik and B. M. Poli.** 2004.  
26  
27 412 Effect of long-term feeding with a plant protein mixture based diet on growth and  
28  
29 413 body/fillet quality traits of large rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss). Aquaculture  
30  
31 414 236:413–429.  
32  
33 415 **De Francesco, M., G. Parisi, J. Pérez-Sánchez, P. Gómez-Réqueni, F. Médale, S. J.**  
34  
35 416 **Kaushik, M. Mecatti and B. M. Poli.** 2007. Effect of high-level fish meal replacement  
36  
37 417 by plant proteins in gilthead sea bream (Sparus aurata) on growth and body/fillet quality  
38  
39 418 traits. Aquaculture Nutrition 13: 361–372.  
40  
41 419 **Drew, M. D., V. J. Racz, R. Gauthier and D. L. Thiessen.** 2005. Effect of adding  
42  
43 420 protease to coextruded flax:pea or canola:pea products on nutrient digestibility and growth  
44  
45 421 performance of rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss). Animal Feed Science and  
46  
47 422 Technology 119:117–128.  
48  
49 423 **Gomes, E. F, G Corraze and S.J Kaushik.** 1993. Effects of dietary incorporation of a  
50  
51 424 co-extruded plant protein (rapeseed and peas) on growth, nutrient utilization and muscle  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

fatty acid composition of rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss). Aquaculture 113:339–353.

**Greene, D. H. S. and D. P. Selivonchick.** 1990. Effects of dietary vegetable, animal and marine lipids on muscle lipid and haematology of rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss). Aquaculture 89:165–182.

**Kiessling, A. and S. Askbrandt.** 1993. Nutritive value of two bacterial strains of single-cell protein for rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss). Aquaculture 109:119–130.

**Johnsen, C. A., Ø. Hagen, M. Adler, E. Jönsson, P. Kling, R. Bickerdike, C. Solberg, B. T. Björnsson and E. Bendiksen.** 2011. Effects of feed, feeding regime and growth rate on flesh quality, connective tissue and plasma hormones in farmed Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar L.). Aquaculture 318:343–354.

**Lesiow, T., H. W. Ockerman and K. Dabrowski.** 2009. Composition, properties and sensory quality of rainbow trout affected by feed formulations. Journal of the World Aquaculture Society 40:678–686.

**MacFie, H. J., N. Bratchell, K. Greenhoff and L. V. Vallis.** 1989. Designs to balance the effect of order of presentation and first-order carry-over effects in hall tests. Journal of Sensory Studies 4(2):129–148.

**Médale, F. and S. Kaushik.** 2008. Evolution of INRA research in the field of fish nutrition : exploring alternatives to marine fishery-derived ingredients. INRA Productions Animales 21:87–94.

**Meilgaard, M., G. V. Civille and B. T. Carr.** 1991. Sensory evaluation techniques (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press.

**Morris, P. C., P. Gallimore, J. Handley, G. Hide, P. Haughton and A. Black.** 2005. Full-fat soya for rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) in freshwater: Effects on

- performance, composition and flesh fatty acid profile in absence of hind-gut enteritis. Aquaculture 248:147–161.
- Müller, H. and A. Skrede.** 2003. Lipids from natural gas-utilising bacteria reduce plasma cholesterol concentrations in mink compared with soybean oil. Int. Symp. on Triglycerides, Metabolic Disorders, and Cardiovascular Disease, New York, July 10–13, Abstract Book, p. 50.
- Øverland, M., O. H. Romarheim, M. Hovin, T. Storebakken and A. Skrede.** 2006. Apparent total tract digestibility of unprocessed and extruded diets containing basic and autolyzed bacterial protein meal grown on natural gas in mink and rainbow trout. Animal Feed Science and Technology 129:237–251.
- Øverland, M., M. Sørensen, T. Storebakken, M. Penn, Å. Krogdahl and A. Skrede.** 2009. Pea protein concentrate substituting fish meal or soybean meal in diets for Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*)-Effect on growth performance, nutrient digestibility, carcass composition, gut health, and physical feed quality. Aquaculture 288:305–311.
- Owen, J. M., J. W. Adron, C. Middleton and C. B. Cowey.** 1975. Elongation and desaturation of dietary fatty acids in turbot (*Scophthalmus maximus*) and rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdneri*). Lipids 10:528–531.
- Palmegiano, G. B., F. Daprà, G. Forneris, F. Gai, L. Gasco, K. Guo, P. G. Peiretti, B. Sicuro and I. Zoccarato.** 2006. Rice protein concentrate meal as a potential ingredient in practical diets for rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). Aquaculture 258:357–367.
- Peiretti, P. G. and G. Meineri.** 2008. Effects on growth performance, carcass characteristics, and the fat and meat fatty acid profile of rabbits fed diets with chia (*Salvia hispanica* L.) seed supplements. Meat Science 80:1116–1121.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Penn, M. H., E. Å. Bendiksen, P. Campbell and Å. Krogdahl.** 2011. High level of dietary pea protein concentrate induces enteropathy in Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar L.). Aquaculture 310:267–273.

**Rumsey, G. L., Hughes, S. G., Smith, R. R., Kinsella, J. E., Shetty, K. J.** 1991. Digestibility and energy values of intact, disrupted and extracts from brewers yeast fed to rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss). Animal Feed Science Technology 33: 185–193.

**Sánchez-Lozano, N. B., S. Martínez-Llorens, A. Tomás-Vidal and M. Jover Cerdá.** 2009. Effect of high-level fish meal replacement by pea and rice concentrate protein on growth, nutrient utilization and fillet quality in gilthead seabream (Sparus aurata L.) Aquaculture 298:83–89.

**Sánchez-Lozano, N. B., S. Martínez-Llorens, A. Tomás-Vidal and M. Jover Cerdá.** 2011. Amino acid retention of gilthead sea bream (Sparus aurata L.) fed with pea protein concentrate. Aquaculture Nutrition 17:e604–e614.

**Sargent, J. R., D. R. Tocher and G. J. Bell,** 2002. The lipids. In: Halver, J.E., Hardy, R. (Eds.), Fish Nutrition, Third edition. Academic Press, San Diego, CA, pp. 181–257.

**Schulz, C., M. Wickert, C. Kijora, J. Ogunji and B. Rennert.** 2007. Evaluation of pea protein isolate as alternative protein source in diets for juvenile tilapia (Oreochromis niloticus). Aquaculture Research 38:537–545.

**Sicuro, B., F. Gai, F. Daprà and G. B. Palmegiano.** 2012. Hybrid sturgeon ‘AL’ (Acipenser naccarii x Acipenser baeri) diets: the use of alternative plant protein sources. Aquaculture Research 43:161–166.

**Storebakken, T., G. Baeverfjord, A. Skrede, J. J. Olli and G. M. Berge.** 2004. Bacterial protein grown on natural gas in diets for Atlantic salmon, Salmo salar, in freshwater. Aquaculture 241:413–425.

- 1  
2  
3 496 **Thiessen, D. L., G. L. Campbell, and P. D. Adelizi.** 2003. Digestibility and growth  
4  
5 497 performance of juvenile rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) fed with pea and canola  
6  
7 498 products. *Aquaculture Nutrition* 9:67–75.  
8  
9 499 **Tibaldi, E., F. Tulli, M. Messina, C. Franchin and E. Badini.** 2005. Pea protein  
10  
11 500 concentrate as a substitute for fish meal protein in sea bass diet. *Italian Journal of Animal*  
12  
13 501 *Science* 4: 597–599.  
14  
15 502 **Tulli, F., M. Messina, M. Calligaris and E. Tibaldi.** 2007. Growth performance of sea  
16  
17 503 bass fed increasing levels of pea-wheat protein in diets varying in fish meal quality. *Italian*  
18  
19 504 *Journal of Animal Science* 6: 833–835.  
20  
21  
22 505  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

506 TABLE 1. Ingredients and proximate composition of experimental diets.

Diets	FM	BPM	PPC	MIX
<u>Ingredients (%)</u>				
Herring fish meal <sup>a</sup>	50.00	25.00	25.00	25.00
Protorsan <sup>b</sup>	0.00	25.00	0.00	12.50
Pea protein concentrate <sup>c</sup>	0.00	0.00	30.00	15.00
Corn meal	23.00	24.00	12.00	17.50
Fish oil	10.00	11.00	12.50	12.00
Corn gluten	8.00	6.00	12.00	9.00
Lignum sulphate	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00
Mineral mixture <sup>d</sup>	1.50	1.50	1.25	1.50
Vitamin mixture <sup>e</sup>	1.50	1.50	1.25	1.50
<u>Proximate composition (%DM)</u>				
Dry matter (% fresh matter)	96.6	92.5	95.9	96.1
Crude protein	45.4	45.9	45.2	45.2
Ether extract	17.3	14.6	16.5	17.0
Ash	12.0	8.9	9.2	9.2
Crude fiber	1.9	2.0	1.9	1.9
Nitrogen free extracts <sup>f</sup>	23.4	28.6	27.2	26.7
Gross energy (MJ/kg DM) <sup>g</sup>	21.5	21.8	22.2	22.1

507 <sup>a</sup> Mangimi Monge, Torre San Giorgio, Italy: DM 91.2%, CP 69%, EE 8.2%, ash 9.6%, CF 0.5%.  
508 <sup>b</sup> Mazzoleni Prodotti Zootecnici, Cologno al Serio, Italy: DM 92%, CP 67%, EE 6%, ash 3.8%, CF 1%.  
509 <sup>c</sup> AgriMarin Nutrition, Stavanger, Norway: DM 90%, CP 55%, starch 9%, EE 2%, ash 6%.  
510 <sup>d</sup> Mineral mixture (g or mg/kg diet): bicalcium phosphate 500 g, calcium carbonate 215 g, sodium salt  
511 40 g, potassium chloride 90 g, magnesium chloride 124 g, magnesium carbonate 124 g, iron sulphate 20 g, zinc

512 sulphate 4 g, copper sulphate 3 g, potassium iodide 4 mg, cobalt sulphate 20 mg, manganese sulphate 3 g,  
513 sodium fluoride 1g, (Granda Zootecnica, Cuneo, Italy).

514 <sup>e</sup> Vitamin mixture (IU or mg/kg diet): DL-a tocopherol acetate, 60 IU; sodium menadione bisulphate, 5  
515 mg; retinyl acetate, 15000 IU; DL-cholecalciferol, 3000 IU; thiamin, 15 mg; riboflavin, 30 mg; pyridoxine, 15  
516 mg; B12, 0.05 mg; nicotinic acid, 175 mg; folic acid, 500 mg; inositol, 1000 mg; biotin, 2.5 mg; calcium  
517 panthotenate, 50 mg; choline chloride, 2000 mg (Granda Zootecnica, Cuneo, Italy).

518 <sup>f</sup> Calculated as 100-(%Crude protein +%Ether extract +%Ash +%Crude fiber).

519 <sup>g</sup> Determined by calorimetric bomb.

520

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

521     TABLE 2. Dietary main fatty acid (% of total fatty acid) composition.

	FM	BPM	PPC	MIX
C14:0	4.70	4.66	4.19	4.56
C15:0	0.34	0.32	0.30	0.32
C16:0	13.39	13.15	12.08	13.00
C16:1n-9	0.20	0.21	0.18	0.21
C16:1n-7	5.13	5.23	4.79	5.17
C16:2n-4	0.62	0.23	0.15	0.15
C17:0	0.27	0.24	0.24	0.24
C16:3n-4	0.69	0.69	0.71	0.61
C17:1n-7	0.18	0.17	0.19	0.22
C18:0	3.57	3.27	3.14	3.15
C18:1n-9	19.53	21.90	20.79	22.09
C18:1n-7	2.86	2.81	2.70	2.81
C18:2n-6	9.56	10.85	11.03	11.20
C18:3n-6	0.21	0.23	0.34	0.19
C18:3n-4	0.16	0.18	0.52	0.18
C18:3n-3	2.36	2.62	2.99	2.83
C18:4n-3	1.66	1.69	1.70	1.71
C20:0	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.30
C20:1n-9	2.24	2.49	2.55	2.66
C20:2n-6	0.44	0.48	0.49	0.47
C20:3n-3	0.14	0.15	0.41	0.11
C20:4n-6	0.67	0.59	0.62	0.62

C21:0	0.22	0.23	0.24	0.11
C20:4n-3	0.81	0.85	0.81	0.82
C20:5n-3	9.55	9.00	8.51	8.73
C22:1n-9	1.68	1.90	1.87	1.90
C22:2n-6	0.45	0.43	1.69	0.70
C22:5n-3	1.91	1.88	1.79	1.84
C22:6n-3	11.01	8.80	9.02	8.80
SFA <sup>a</sup>	22.74	22.14	20.44	21.69
MUFA <sup>b</sup>	31.83	34.72	33.07	35.05
PUFA <sup>c</sup>	39.81	38.24	39.11	38.27
PUFA n-3 <sup>d</sup>	27.44	24.99	25.23	24.85
PUFA n-6 <sup>e</sup>	11.34	12.58	14.19	13.17
n-3/n-6	2.42	1.99	1.78	1.89

<sup>a</sup> Saturated fatty acids.

<sup>b</sup> Monounsaturated fatty acids.

<sup>c</sup> Polyunsaturated fatty acids.

<sup>d</sup> Polyunsaturated fatty acids serie n-3.

<sup>e</sup> Polyunsaturated fatty acids serie n-6.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

528 TABLE 3. Apparent digestibility coefficients (%) of nutrients and gross energy of the  
529 experimental diets (means  $\pm$  SD; n=9).

Diets	FM	BPM	PPC	MIX
Dry matter	69.97 $\pm$ 0.67	69.23 $\pm$ 0.25	70.33 $\pm$ 1.29	67.33 $\pm$ 1.92
Crude protein	90.30 $\pm$ 0.28 <sup>a</sup>	84.20 $\pm$ 0.28 <sup>b</sup>	88.90 $\pm$ 0.28 <sup>a</sup>	85.40 $\pm$ 1.13 <sup>b</sup>
Ether extract	97.35 $\pm$ 0.78	96.90 $\pm$ 0.28	95.70 $\pm$ 0.28	96.35 $\pm$ 0.21
Gross energy	79.93 $\pm$ 1.62	77.00 $\pm$ 2.26	78.50 $\pm$ 3.04	74.87 $\pm$ 2.97

530 In the row, different letters mean statistical difference at  $P \leq 0.05$ .

531 TABLE 4. Growth performance, feed utilization and whole body composition (n=5) in rainbow trout fed experimental diets.

	<u>ad libitum</u>				Rationed				Significance		
	FM	BPM	PPC	MIX	FM	BPM	PPC	MIX	Diet effect	F.R. effect	Interaction
WG <sup>a</sup>	113.5	39.5	99.4	102.5	100.4	40.6	99.8	91.8	0.000	0.082	0.250
SGR <sup>b</sup>	0.90	0.40	0.80	0.80	0.85	0.40	0.80	0.77	0.000	0.360	0.815
PER <sup>c</sup>	1.63	0.67	1.75	1.63	1.60	0.80	1.77	1.57	0.000	0.790	0.459
FCR <sup>d</sup>	1.40	3.53	1.25	1.33	1.40	2.70	1.23	1.40	0.000	0.246	0.213
VSI <sup>e</sup>	10.8	12.4	11.7	13.0	9.8	10.8	11.5	12.3	0.025	0.095	0.790
HSI <sup>f</sup>	1.02	1.17	1.08	1.40	1.04	1.13	1.20	1.25	0.007	0.803	0.418
CF <sup>g</sup>	1.20	1.15	1.26	1.26	1.09	0.99	1.18	1.22	0.002	0.005	0.577
CY <sup>h</sup>	88.2	86.4	87.2	85.6	89.1	88.1	87.3	86.5	0.015	0.107	0.774

<sup>a</sup> Weight gain, (g) =[FBW (final body weight, g) –IBW (initial body weight, g)].

<sup>b</sup> Specific growth rate (%) =[lnFBW–lnIBW)/number of feeding days]\*100.

<sup>c</sup> Protein efficiency ratio =[WG (weight gain,g)/total protein fed (g DM)].

<sup>d</sup> Feed conversion ratio=[total feed supplied (g DM)/WG (weight gain, g)].

<sup>e</sup> Viscerosomatic index, (%) =[gut weight (g)/ fish weight (g)]\*100.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

537        <sup>f</sup> Hepatosomatic index, (%) =[liver weight (g)/ fish weight (g)]\*100.

538        <sup>g</sup> Condition factor, (%) =[ fish weight (g)/ fish length (cm)<sup>3</sup>]\*100.

539        <sup>h</sup> Carcass yield, (%) =[carcass weight (g)/ fish weight (g)]\*100.

540

For Peer Review

541 TABLE 5. Fatty acids in fillets (n=5): composition (% of total fatty acid).

	<u>ad libitum</u>				Rationed				Significance		
	FM	BPM	PPC	MIX	FM	BPM	PPC	MIX	Diet effect	F.R. effect	Interaction
C14:0	3.35	3.33	2.94	3.47	3.17	3.11	3.15	3.23	0.375	0.374	0.523
C15:0	0.28	0.29	0.24	0.28	0.27	0.27	0.25	0.27	0.026	0.410	0.482
C16:0	14.60	14.70	14.06	15.06	14.56	14.34	14.82	14.50	0.618	0.783	0.085
C16:1n-9	0.25	0.24	0.24	0.26	0.14	0.25	0.23	0.19	0.332	0.032	0.136
C16:1n-7	4.28	4.20	3.83	4.39	4.01	4.06	4.01	3.94	0.590	0.231	0.484
C16:2n-4	0.27	0.21	0.39	0.41	0.21	0.15	0.14	0.17	0.000	0.000	0.000
C17:0	0.28	0.30	0.21	0.28	0.28	0.27	0.26	0.27	0.005	0.663	0.053
C16:3n-4	0.25	0.24	0.27	0.29	0.18	0.14	0.12	0.21	0.010	0.000	0.142
C18:0	3.29	3.26	3.14	3.37	3.20	3.40	3.21	3.33	0.279	0.805	0.611
C18:1n-9	19.23	20.06	18.96	20.30	18.19	19.57	17.59	19.95	0.022	0.082	0.849
C18:1n-7	2.80	2.68	2.54	2.05	2.68	2.64	2.53	2.63	0.300	0.514	0.387
C18:2n-6	12.01	13.79	16.13	12.88	12.41	14.71	15.82	13.11	0.001	0.603	0.904
C18:3n-6	0.27	0.34	0.35	0.29	0.30	0.29	0.34	0.31	0.005	0.714	0.117



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

C18:3n-4	0.34	0.38	0.40	0.37	0.29	0.28	0.29	0.31	0.731	0.000	0.576
C18:3n-3	1.69	2.11	1.93	2.00	1.70	2.05	1.71	1.91	0.000	0.068	0.400
C18:4n-3	0.99	1.14	0.95	1.05	0.93	1.04	1.00	1.04	0.101	0.441	0.586
C20:0	0.08	0.19	0.14	0.19	0.18	0.19	0.16	0.12	0.371	0.640	0.158
C20:1n-9	2.11	2.02	1.64	2.19	1.69	2.02	1.34	1.94	0.001	0.019	0.482
C20:2n-6	0.69	0.67	0.76	0.71	0.65	0.74	0.64	0.71	0.688	0.454	0.082
C20:3n-3	0.38	0.37	0.50	0.39	0.56	0.47	0.48	0.38	0.554	0.259	0.503
C20:4n-6	0.70	0.63	0.62	0.65	0.70	0.63	0.64	0.64	0.001	0.796	0.909
C21:0	0.21	0.21	0.18	0.22	0.15	0.17	0.04	0.21	0.006	0.003	0.162
C20:4n-3	0.95	0.93	0.91	1.01	0.96	0.92	0.84	0.85	0.299	0.049	0.188
C20:5n-3	5.59	5.77	5.17	5.59	5.48	5.39	5.56	5.44	0.749	0.727	0.479
C22:1n-9	1.04	1.13	0.76	1.10	0.82	0.29	0.21	0.28	0.000	0.000	0.001
C22:2n-6	0.46	0.48	0.34	0.40	0.91	0.38	0.37	0.38	0.210	0.466	0.366
C22:5n-3	2.15	2.11	2.07	2.11	2.15	2.03	2.24	1.98	0.293	0.810	0.139
C22:6n-3	18.60	15.44	17.38	16.31	19.77	16.08	18.32	17.46	0.013	0.189	0.993

542

543 TABLE 6. Relationship of fatty acids in fillets (n=5): composition (% of total fatty acid) to nutritional quality.

	<u>ad libitum</u>				Rationed				Significance		
	FM	BPM	PPC	MIX	FM	BPM	PPC	MIX	Diet effect	F.R. effect	Interaction
SFA <sup>a</sup>	22.09	22.28	20.90	22.87	21.82	21.73	21.90	21.91	0.147	0.504	0.126
MUFA <sup>d</sup>	29.71	30.34	27.97	30.30	27.52	28.82	25.91	28.94	0.049	0.019	0.971
PUFA <sup>c</sup>	44.87	44.12	47.84	44.05	46.30	44.92	48.16	44.51	0.004	0.299	0.945
PUFA n-3 <sup>d</sup>	30.34	27.87	28.91	28.46	31.56	27.97	30.15	29.05	0.037	0.294	0.934
PUFA n-6 <sup>e</sup>	14.13	15.91	18.21	14.93	14.96	16.76	17.82	15.14	0.002	0.536	0.868
n-3/n-6	2.18	1.76	1.64	1.91	2.15	1.69	1.70	1.93	0.003	0.952	0.962

544 <sup>a</sup> Saturated fatty acids.545 <sup>b</sup> Monounsaturated fatty acids.546 <sup>c</sup> Polyunsaturated fatty acids.547 <sup>d</sup> Polyunsaturated fatty acids series n-3.548 <sup>e</sup> Polyunsaturated fatty acids series n-6.

TABLE 7. Parameters of fillet pH (n=12) and colour (n=24) in rainbow trout fed experimental diets.

	ad libitum				Rationed				Significance		
	FM	BPM	PPC	MIX	FM	BPM	PPC	MIX	Diet effect	F.R. effect	Interaction
pH <sub>24</sub>	6.56	6.76	6.58	6.63	6.65	6.74	6.67	6.75	0.000	0.000	0.063
L <sup>a</sup>	44.9	46.4	47.8	48.9	44.2	45.5	45.6	44.8	0.004	0.000	0.051
a <sup>b</sup>	1.14	1.84	1.00	0.84	1.84	1.83	1.33	1.84	0.066	0.007	0.234
b <sup>c</sup>	5.08	3.12	6.71	6.33	4.33	3.14	7.19	5.53	0.000	0.435	0.460

<sup>a</sup> Lightness.

<sup>b</sup> Redness.

<sup>c</sup> Yellowness.

555 TABLE 8. Composition (% dry matter) of fillets (n=5).

	<u>ad libitum</u>				Rationed				Significance		
	FM	BPM	PPC	MIX	FM	BPM	PPC	MIX	Diet effect	F.R. effect	Interaction
Dry matter <sup>a</sup>	24.1	23.0	23.4	24.5	25.9	24.3	26.9	24.8	0.480	0.017	0.451
Crude protein	89.7	92.3	90.3	90.2	88.5	92.0	88.1	88.9	0.021	0.085	0.836
Ether extract	8.0	14.5	10.8	8.6	9.8	7.7	10.1	10.6	0.440	0.357	0.018
Ash	6.7	7.6	7.5	7.3	6.3	6.5	6.1	6.8	0.056	0.000	0.076

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

557 TABLE 9. Preferences of flesh expressed as Rank sums.


	<u>ad libitum</u>				Rationed			
	MIX	BPM	PPC	FM	MIX	BPM	PPC	FM
Rank	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Rank sum	72a	89ab	90ab	109b	79	90	91	100

558 Rank sum of the preference ranking test for each trout flesh.

559 Rank sums with different superscripts indicate significant differences among  
560 treatments ( $P \leq 0.05$ ).


561

FIGURE 1. Results from ranking test of fillets from trout fed ad libitum (where 1 = most preferred and 4 = least preferred). Legend: FM = Fish meal diet; BPM = Bacterial protein diet; PPC = Pea protein diet; MIX = Bacterial protein diet+Pea protein diet.




1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

FIGURE 2. Box-plot of ranks. Legend: Feeding regime ad libitum: FM ad l. = Fish meal diet; BPM ad l. = Bacterial protein diet; PPC ad l. = Pea protein diet; MIX ad l. = Bacterial protein diet+Pea protein diet. Rationed feeding regime: FM r =Fish meal diet; BPM r =Bacterial protein diet; PPC r = Pea protein diet; MIX r = Bacterial protein diet+Pea protein diet.



review

FIGURE 3. Results from ranking test of fillets from trout fed rationed diets (where 1 = most preferred and 4 = least preferred). Legend: FM = Fish meal diet; BPM = Bacterial protein diet; PPC = Pea protein diet; MIX = Bacterial protein diet+Pea protein diet.





1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

FIGURE 4. Correspondence analysis of sensory data. Position of the fillets of trout and ranks in the plane formed by the first two dimensions. . Legend: Feeding regime ad libitum: FM ad l. = Fish meal diet; BPM ad l. = Bacterial protein diet; PPC ad l. = Pea protein diet; MIX ad l. = Bacterial protein diet+Pea protein diet. Rationed feeding regime: FM r =Fish meal diet; BPM r =Bacterial protein diet; PPC r = Pea protein diet; MIX r = Bacterial protein diet+Pea protein diet.

